



# Municipal Heritage Committee Report

---

**Report Number:** KLMHC2024-034  
**Meeting Date:** June 6, 2024  
**Title:** **Planning Act Application – 46-66 William Street North, Lindsay**  
**Description:** Review of application for Zoning By-law Amendment and Official Plan Amendment for 77-83 William Street North, Lindsay  
**Author and Title:** Emily Turner, Economic Development Officer – Heritage Planning

---

**Recommendations:**

**That** Report KLMHC2024-034, **46-66 William Street North, Lindsay**, be received; and

**That** comments be provided to Planning staff through the Chair.

**Department Head:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Financial/Legal/HR/Other:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Chief Administrative Officer:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Background:**

The City has received a new submission for Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments for the property known municipally as 46-66 William Street North. The initial proposal was to construct an 8 storey apartment building with 207 units on the site. A revised proposal was received from the application in spring 2023 and has reduced the size of the structure to 8 storeys and provided new architectural design. The building will contain both underground and at grade parking. New architectural and site plan drawings were submitted. The Committee reviewed and commented on the original application in January 2021 and revised applications in June 2023 and December 2023. The Committee’s comments from December 2023 are attached as Appendix A. The comments from the Committee as well as City staff were returned to the applicant and the submission has been revised again to address some of the concerns raised by the City, as well as to provide responses to the comments received.

The applicant is proposing as follows:

- a) The Official Plan amendment proposed to increase the net residential density from 100 units per square hectare.
- b) The “Central Commercial (CC) Zone” in the Town of Lindsay Zoning By-law is proposed to be amended to permit the construction of an eight storey apartment building by amending provisions related setbacks, building height, lot coverage, density and parking. The applicant has requested the following zoning provisions changes to accommodate the project:

<b>Lot Regulation</b>	<b>CC Zone</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
Minimum front yard setback	4 metres	0 metres
Minimum exterior side yard setback	4 metres	0 metre
Maximum building height	15 metres	41 metres
Maximum lot coverage	24%	52.5%
Maximum gross floor area as % of lot area	200%	433%
Minimum landscaped open space	40%	14.17%
Minimum parking spaces	104 spaces + 4 accessible spaces	83 spaces + 3 accessible spaces
Maximum density for commercial or mixed	2 times the lot area	4.3 times the lot area

commercial/residential development		
Maximum density of residential apartment building per gross hectare	100 units	690 units
Landscape buffer requirement around parking lot	1.8 metres	0 metres

- c) The original application also proposed to define a new use, currently not permitted in the CC Zone, on the subject lands. This use would be known as an Independent Seniors’ Apartment Building, with the intent to provide a living space for seniors who do not require care or services normally found in a Senior Citizens’ Home. It is unclear from the revised application if this use is still proposed. The ground floor is intended for commercial and retail use, in accordance with the CC Zone.

This report is intended to provide the comments submitted back from the applicant and its heritage consultant, MHBC, in relation to the Committee’s comments. The revised architectural drawings for the proposed development are attached as Appendix C.

**Rationale:**

The Committee may wish to provide comments regarding the application as currently submitted, as well as the response to the Committee’s previous comments from MHBC. The Committee may or may not agree with the comments provided by MHBC and should submit comments to confirm it has reviewed the response and any additional information it wish to include. In its response, MHBC has also indicated that it would like to discuss architectural design as part of the Site Plan application process. The Committee should acknowledge the response in this regard and may wish to provide some general comments as to what it will be looking for in the SPA so that the applicant is aware that these comments will be forthcoming as part of the next phase of approvals, should the OPA and ZBA applications be approved.

**Other Alternatives Considered:**

There are no recommended alternatives.

### **Financial/Operation Impacts:**

There are no financial or operational impacts as a result of the recommendations of this report.

### **Consultations:**

Planning Staff  
Applicant

### **Attachments:**

Appendix A – 46-66 William Street North Municipal Heritage Committee Comments  
(December 2023)



Adobe Acrobat  
Document

Appendix B – Response to MHC Comments



Adobe Acrobat  
Document

Appendix C – Revised Architectural Drawings



Adobe Acrobat  
Document

**Department Head email:** [lbarrie@kawarthalakes.ca](mailto:lbarrie@kawarthalakes.ca)

**Department Head:** Leah Barrie, Director of Development Services